

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,412	09/10/2003	Neil Raymond Joffe	2705-394	5824	
20575 75	7590 • 07/20/2006		EXAMINER		
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.			HSU, ALPUS		
210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1011121112,			2616		
			DATE MAIL ED: 07/20/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 07/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4
~

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/660,412	JOFFE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alpus H. Hsu	2616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/10/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/660,412 Page 2

Art Unit: 2616

1. Claims 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 19, line 12, "the received voice message" has no clear antecedent. Is it referring to the received voice message as in line 10 or in line 11? It is also unclear as to what "manipulating the received voice message" means. In what sense is the voice message manipulated.

In claims 25 and 32, line 9, "the received voice message" has no clear antecedent. Is it referring to the received voice message as in line 7 or in line 8? It is also unclear as to what "editing the received voice message" means. In what sense is the voice message edited. Is it before the voice message being converted to email message or after?

- 2. Claims 1-24 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,142. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because by omitting the host server in claim 1, and interpreting the second receiving step and editing step in claim 18 as the claimed manipulating step, claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,142 claim the same invention as claims 1-24 of the instant application.
- 3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 2616

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)/(e) as being anticipated by AGRAHARAM et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,085,231 or BERKLEY et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,546,005.

Referring to claim 25, AGRAHARAM discloses a voice communication system for use within a packet switching network environment (109) for communicating voice information, initiated by a telephone user (104), included within electronic mail (email) messages, to an email recipient comprising: means for receiving a voice message by a network device (105), the voice message being generated by the telephone user; means for converting the received voice message to an email message (115); means for continuing to receive the voice message (105); means for editing the received voice message(115); and means for streaming the email message, in the

Application/Control Number: 10/660,412 Page 4

Art Unit: 2616

form of packets, out of the network device (115), for transmission thereof as the voice message is being received (see col. 1, line 51 to col. 2, line 9, col. 2, line 43 to col. 3, line 35).

Similarly, BERKLEY also discloses a voice communication system for use within a packet switching network environment (170) for communicating voice information, initiated by a telephone user (170), included within electronic mail (email) messages, to an email recipient comprising: means for receiving a voice message by a network device (170), the voice message being generated by the telephone user; means for converting the received voice message to an email message (170); means for continuing to receive the voice message (170); means for editing the received voice message(170); and means for streaming the email message, in the form of packets, out of the network device (170), for transmission thereof as the voice message is being received (see col. 5, lines 12-25, col. 12, line66 to col. 13, line 16).

- 6. Claims 26-31 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. Claim 32 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Agraharam et al. '899, Dorfman et al., Hamilton et al., and Benjamin et al. are cited to show the common feature of integrated voice messaging system utilizing conversion of voice to email scheme similar to the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/660,412 Page 5

Art Unit: 2616

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alpus H. Hsu whose telephone number is (571)272-3146. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (5:30-3:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571)272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AHH

Alpus H. Hsu Primary Examiner Art Unit 2616

Alpus n. ngo